UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,822	08/29/2001	Arturo Fagundo	50325-0589 (4410)	9226

29989   7590   07/17/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/942,822	FAGUNDO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristie Shingles	2141	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 April 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>20060705</u>.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment
Claims 1, 16, 24 and 26-29 have been amended.
Claims 30-39 are new.

Claims 1-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 16 and 26-29 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in
> this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3.   **Claims 1-10, 13, 14, 16-32 and 35-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by *Goertzel et al* (6,208,952).

        a.   **Per claim 1**, *Goertzel et al* teach a method for translating between logical

addresses and ports of a first network and a logical address and ports of a second network

connected to the first network at an intermediate device, the method comprising the computer-

implemented step of:

- receiving at the intermediate device a first packet from a first device having a first address on the first network (col.4 lines 20-25);

- sending a second packet to a second device on the second network in response to receiving the first packet, the second packet including, in a source address field, data indicating a particular address of the intermediate device on the second network (col.4 lines 25-27 and 57-60, col.4 line 66-col.5 line 10);

- determining whether the first packet includes a first message that registers a first resource on the first device with a protocol server for a particular protocol, the protocol server available at the second device on the second network (col.4 lines 25-29 and 38-48, col.6 lines 40-60),

- wherein: the particular protocol does not support translated ports for requesting network resources, and the protocol server is configured to register unique names for resources provided by devices on the second network according to the particular protocol (col.4 lines 38-59, col.5 lines 39-46, col.6 lines 45-57, col.7 lines 8-34, col.8 lines 4-32, col.10 lines 17-40—the protocols and interfaces of the well-known endpoints, not translated ports, are registered with unique string bindings); and

- if it is determined that the first packet includes the first message registering the first resource, then determining first information in the first message for uniquely requesting the first resource, and storing data indicating the first information in a first data structure in association with the first address (col.5 lines 21-64, col.6 lines 9-24 and 40-60, col.7 line 36-col.8 line 3—provision for determining if the client request contains protocol information, determining if the protocol is registered with the server and storing the protocol along with client data in the Oxid/Protocol table).

b.   **Claims 16 and 26-29** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c.   **Per claim 2,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the computer-implemented step of: receiving at the intermediate device a third packet from a third device on the second network; determining whether the third packet includes a second message requesting a second resource according to the particular protocol; and if it is determined that the third packet includes the second message requesting the second resource,

then determining second information in the second message for uniquely requesting the second

resource, determining whether the second information matches the first information in the data

structure, and if the second information matches the first information, sending the second

message to the first device having the first address associated with the first information (col.9

line 47-col.10 line 10).

        d.   **Claims 30 and 35** are substantially similar to claim 2 and are therefore rejected

under the same basis.

        e.   **Per claim 3,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, further teach

the method, wherein, if it is determined that the first packet includes the first message, then

inserting in the second packet a second message based on the first message (col.4 lines 25-27,

col.5 lines 2-6).

        f.   **Claims 17, 31 and 36** is substantially equivalent to claim 3 and are therefore

rejected under the same basis.

        g.   **Per claim 4,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 3, wherein the

second message is the same as the first message (col.4 lines 25-27, col.5 lines 2-6).

        h.   **Claim 18** is substantially similar to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under the

same basis.

        i.   **Per claim 5,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 3, further

comprising the computer-implemented step of generating the second message by replacing, in a

source address field, data indicating the first address with data indicating the particular address

of the intermediate device on the second network (col.4 lines 27-31 and 62-66, col.5 lines 8-10).

j.   **Claim 6** is substantially similar to claims 3 and 5 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

k.   **Per claim 7,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the particular protocol uses a well-known port for requesting the first resource (col.4 lines 21-25, col.5 lines 26-34 and 54-64).

l.   **Per claim 8,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method of Claim 1, wherein the particular protocol is a network basic input and output system (NetBIOS) open protocol (col.1 lines 62-65).

m.   **Claims 9, 20, 25, 32 and 37** are substantially similar to claim 8 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

n.   **Per claim 10,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the first information is a resource name (col.4 lines 25-27, col.5 lines 2-6).

o.   **Claim 21** is substantially similar to claim 10 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

p.   **Claim 19** is substantially similar to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

q.   **Per claim 13,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the third packet includes, in a destination address field, data indicating the particular address of the intermediate device (col.5 lines 8-10, col.9 line 47-col.10 line 10).

r.   **Claim 22** is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

s.   **Claims 14 and 23** are substantially similar to claims 7 and 13 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

t.   **Per claim 24,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 16, wherein the first device obtains the first information from a protocol server that is not on the first network (col.4 lines 27-33).

4.   <u>Claims 11, 12, 33 and 38</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goertzel et al* (US 6,208,952) in view of *Blum et al* (US 6,182,141).

a.   **Per claim 11,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method Claim 5 as applied above, yet fail to explicitly teach the method as recited in Claim 5, wherein the protocol server is a name server that stores a resource name of the first resource in the second message in association with an address based on data in the source address field of the second message. However, *Blum et al* teach p server with protocol filters and a local DNS capabilities to store and resolve requested resource names and IP addresses (col.7 lines 35-58, col.8 line 11-col.9 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Goertzel et al* with *Blum et al* for the purpose of recording and maintaining an updated account of resource names in a server for use in resolving the requested resource to the requesting clients via the appropriate protocols.

b.   **Claims 12, 33 and 38** are substantially similar to claim 11 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

5.   <u>Claims 15, 34 and 39</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goertzel et al* (US 6,208,952) in view of *Graham et al* (US 6,594,700).

a. **Per claim 15,** *Goertzel et al* teach the method of Claim 1 further comprising the computer-implemented steps of: monitoring messages associated with registering the first resource with the protocol server; determining whether the first resource is not registered with the protocol server; and if it is determined that the first resource is not registered with the protocol server (col.7 lines 11-34, col.7 line 55-col.8 line 3, col.10 lines 23-38). Yet *Goertzel et al* fail to explicitly teach then removing from the first data structure the data indicating the first information in association the first address, if the first resource is not registered with the protocol server. However, *Graham et al* teach determining if the resource is registered with the protocol server, if the resource is not registered then the process end (col.9 lines 24-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Goertzel et al* with *Graham et al* for the purpose of maintaining an updated account of resource locations in a server for efficient accessibility of the resource. Because network resources change frequently, it is important to keep a current entry of where the resource is and to remove or revise its old information.

b. **Claims 34 and 39** are substantially similar to claim 15 and are therefore rejected under the same basis

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Kandasamy (6,219,799), Ainsworth et al (6,366,958), Chavez Jr. (6,968,390), Kapoor et al (5,682,534), Firth et al (6,931,647), Dowling et al (2002/0053032).

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**   See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.   In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.   In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888.   The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880.   The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER